

Appl. No. 10/668,470
Amdt. dated March 7, 2005
Reply to final office action of January 6, 2005

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REMARKS

This is in response to the final office action mailed on January 6, 2005. The final office action rejected Applicant's Claims 1-8, 11, 13 and 16 as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. App. No. 2003/0083813 ("Park"). The final office action also indicated that Claims 9, 10, 12, 14, 17 and 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The Office Action allowed Claims 14 and 19-26.

With this response, Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of Claim 17, and Claim 17 has been canceled. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider independent Claims 4, 6 and 7 the present application in view of the following remarks. Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Allowed Claims and Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the allowance of Claims 14, 19-26 and the indication that Claims 9, 10, 12, 14, 17 and 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants have rewritten Claim 17 in independent form as amended independent Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 is in condition for allowance

Independent Claim 4

Applicants' independent Claim 4 relates to a method for developing traffic messages. The method comprises obtaining traffic data that include a location description for each of the traffic conditions, wherein the location description provides a main road along which the traffic condition exists and a cross road proximate the traffic condition on the main road. The location description of the main road and cross road is converted into a location reference code. Claim 4 is not anticipated by Park because Park fails to disclose or suggest every claim element recited by the claim. Specifically, Park does not disclose or suggest that the location description of the traffic condition provides a main road along which the traffic condition exists and a cross road proximate the traffic condition on the main road and the location description of the main road and cross road being converted into a location reference code.

Appl. No. 10/668,470
Amdt. dated March 7, 2005
Reply to final office action of January 6, 2005

Park discloses an information system that provides optimal travel routes to mobile units by considering real-time traffic information. The information center includes a traffic information server that obtains real-time traffic information gathered by traffic sensors. The traffic sensors are installed on the roads and periodically detect travel speeds for their location. (*see*, Park: page 3, paragraph 0037). Although Park discloses the information center obtaining traffic data of traffic conditions, Park does not disclose the location description of the traffic condition providing a main road and a cross road, and Park does not disclose converting the location description of the main road and cross road into the location reference code. Rather, Park merely discloses the traffic sensors reporting traffic speeds for their respective location along the road. That is, the location description for the Park system is the known installed location of the traffic sensor on the road, not the main road and cross road location description. Furthermore, although Park discloses that a mobile unit may obtain information about traffic on roads, points of interest, news and weather from the information center (*see*, Park: page 3, paragraph 0028), Park does not suggest the location description of a main road and cross road.

Accordingly, because Park fails to disclose or suggest all of the recited claim elements, Applicant's Claim 4 is not anticipated by Park.

Independent Claim 6

Applicants' independent Claim 6 relates to a method for developing traffic messages. The method comprises obtaining traffic data that include a location description for each of the traffic conditions, wherein the location description provides a point of interest proximate the traffic condition. The location description of the point of interest is converted into a location reference code. Claim 6 is not anticipated by Park because Park fails to disclose or suggest every claim element recited by the claim. Specifically, Park does not disclose or suggest that the location description of the traffic condition provides a point of interest and the location description of the point of interest being converted into a location reference code.

Park discloses an information system that provides optimal travel routes to mobile units by considering real-time traffic information. The information center includes a traffic information server that obtains real-time traffic information gathered by traffic sensors.

Appl. No. 10/668,470

Amdt. dated March 7, 2005

Reply to final office action of January 6, 2005

The traffic sensors are installed on the roads and periodically detect travel speeds for their location. (*see*, Park: page 3, paragraph 0037). Although Park discloses the information center obtaining traffic data of traffic conditions, Park does not disclose the location description of the traffic condition providing a point of interest, and Park does not disclose converting the location description of the point of interest into the location reference code. Rather, Park merely discloses the traffic sensors reporting traffic speeds for their respective location along the road. That is, the location description for the Park system is the known installed location of the traffic sensor on the road, not the point of interest location description. Furthermore, although Park discloses that a mobile unit may obtain information about points of interest from the information center (*see*, Park: page 3, paragraph 0028), Park does not suggest the location description of a point of interest.

Accordingly, because Park fails to disclose or suggest all of the recited claim elements, Applicant's Claim 6 is not anticipated by Park.

Independent Claim 7

Applicants' independent Claim 7 relates to a method for developing traffic messages. The method comprises obtaining traffic data that include a location description for each of the traffic conditions, wherein the location description provides an address proximate the traffic condition. The location description of the address is converted into a location reference code. Claim 7 is not anticipated by Park because Park fails to disclose or suggest every claim element recited by the claim. Specifically, Park does not disclose or suggest that the location description of the traffic condition provides an address and the location description of the address being converted into a location reference code.

Park discloses an information system that provides optimal travel routes to mobile units by considering real-time traffic information. The information center includes a traffic information server that obtains real-time traffic information gathered by traffic sensors. The traffic sensors are installed on the roads and periodically detect travel speeds for their location. (*see*, Park: page 3, paragraph 0037). Although Park discloses the information center obtaining traffic data of traffic conditions, Park does not disclose the location description of the traffic condition providing an address, and Park does not disclose converting the location description of the address into the location reference code. Rather,

Appl. No. 10/668,470
Amtdt. dated March 7, 2005
Reply to final office action of January 6, 2005

Park merely discloses the traffic sensors reporting traffic speeds for their respective location along the road. That is, the location description for the Park system is the known installed location of the traffic sensor on the road, not the address location description. Furthermore, although Park discloses that a mobile unit may obtain information about points of interest and enter destinations from the information center (*see*, Park: page 3, paragraph 0028), Park does not suggest the location description of an address.

Accordingly, because Park fails to disclose or suggest all of the recited claim elements, Applicant's Claim 7 is not anticipated by Park.

Applicant's dependent Claims 2-3, 5, 8-13, 15, 16 and 18

Applicant's dependent Claims 2-3, 5, 8-13, 15, 16 and 18 are allowable at least for the reason that they depend upon allowable base claims. In addition, these claims include features that are not disclosed by the cited references.

Conclusion

With the present response, all the issues in the final office action mailed January 6, 2005 have been addressed. Applicant submits that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance. If any issues remain, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Jon D. Shutter
Reg. No. 41,311
Patent Counsel

NAVTEQ North America, LLC
222 Merchandise Mart Plaza Drive, Suite 900
Chicago, IL 60654
(312) 894-7000 x7365

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☒ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☒ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.